

**A Numerical Gamma-Ray Burst Simulation Using
Three-Dimensional Relativistic Hydrodynamics: The Transition
from Spherical to Jet-like Expansion**

John K. Cannizzo¹

e-mail: cannizzo@stars.gsfc.nasa.gov

NASA/GSFC/Laboratory for High Energy Astrophysics, Code 661, Greenbelt, MD 20771

Neil Gehrels

e-mail: gehrels@lheapop.gsfc.nasa.gov

NASA/GSFC/Laboratory for High Energy Astrophysics, Code 661, Greenbelt, MD 20771

Ethan T. Vishniac

e-mail: ethan@pha.jhu.edu

Department of Physics and Astronomy, Johns Hopkins University, 3400 N. Charles Street,
Baltimore, MD 21210

to appear in the Astrophysical Journal

Received 2003 June 9; accepted 2003 October 3

¹also University of Maryland Baltimore County

ABSTRACT

We present the first unrestricted, three-dimensional relativistic hydrodynamical calculations of the blob of gas associated with the jet producing a gamma-ray burst. We investigate the deceleration phase of the blob corresponding to the time when afterglow radiation is produced, concentrating on the transition in which the relativistic beaming γ^{-1} goes from being less than θ , where γ is the bulk Lorentz factor and θ is the angular width of the jet, to γ^{-1} greater than θ . We study the time dependent evolution of the physical parameters associated with the jet, both parallel to the direction of motion and perpendicular to it. We calculate light curves for observers at varying angles with respect to the velocity vector of the blob, assuming optically thin emission that scales with the local pressure. Our main findings are that (i) gas ahead of the advancing blob does not accrete onto and merge with the blob material but rather flows around the blob, (ii) the decay light curve steepens at a time corresponding roughly to $\gamma^{-1} \approx \theta$ (in accord with earlier studies), and (iii) the rate of decrease of the forward component of momentum in the blob is well-fit by a simple model in which the gas in front of the blob exerts a drag force on the blob, and the cross sectional area of the blob increases quadratically with laboratory time (or distance).

Subject headings: gamma rays: bursts - hydrodynamics - relativity - shock waves

1. Introduction

Gamma-ray bursts are the most powerful explosions in the Universe. (For reviews see Piran 1999 and Mészáros 2002.) A crucial advance in understanding gamma-ray bursts began with the discovery of “afterglows”, starting with *BeppoSax* observations in the soft X-ray band of GRB 970228 (Costa et al. 1997; Wijers, Rees, & Mészáros 1997). (For a review of GRB afterglows see van Paradijs, Kouveliotou, & Wijers 2000.) If GRBs were isotropic, then the measured redshifts would imply total explosion energies of $\sim 10^{52} - 10^{54}$ ergs (Frail et al. 2001). Theoretical work on relativistic jet expansion, however, shows that one expects a steepening in the decay light curve if one is looking down the axis of a jet as the flow decelerates from a bulk Lorentz factor $\gamma^{-1} < \theta$ to $\gamma^{-1} > \theta$, where θ is the jet beaming angle (e.g., Rhoads 1997, Sari, Piran, & Halpern 1999, Panaitescu & Mészáros 1999, Panaitescu & Kumar 2001ab, 2002). One does in fact see such steepenings in the light curves (e.g., Stanek et al. 1999; Harrison et al. 1999). Prior to the time when $\gamma^{-1} \simeq \theta$ the expansion is effectively “spherical” from the observer’s viewpoint because the relativistic beaming is narrower than the jet itself. In other words, if the GRB emission were coming from one spot on a large, relativistically expanding sphere, aimed directly at the observer, the observer would not see any emission from the other parts of the sphere. After the time when $\gamma^{-1} \simeq \theta$ the observer can “see” the entire jet, and a faster rate of decline in the luminosity is predicted. A separate issue that we will address in this work is the sideways or lateral expansion of the jet as the increasing solid angle of the jet enables a larger fraction of the circumstellar medium (CSM) surrounding the progenitor star to be intercepted and provide decelerating gas. Several groups have claimed that this leads to a faster (exponential) decrease in γ , which acts as an additional agent to diminish the amplitude of the relativistic beaming.

The concept of a “break” in the afterglow light curves occurring when $\gamma^{-1} \simeq \theta$ has

been used to infer the presence of strong beaming in GRBs (Frail et al. 2001; Panaitescu & Kumar 2001ab, 2002; Panaitescu, Mészáros, & Rees 1998; Piran, Kumar, Panaitescu, & Piro 2001). Frail et al. (2001) utilize the theoretical framework of Sari, Piran, & Halpern (1999) which takes the jet evolution to be spherical adiabatic expansion to show that, after correcting the “isotropic” energies to account for the specific beaming factor for each burst, the total burst energy reduces to a narrow range centered on $\sim 5 \times 10^{50}$ ergs. Frail et al. (2001) give a tabulation of 17 afterglows for which redshifts had been measured, up to 2001 January. The redshifts range from 0.433 to 4.5. Of these, 10 also have break times known to within $\sim 30\%$, ranging from 1 d to 25 d. (In addition, three GRBs have listed lower limits on the break time, and two have listed upper limits.) The combination of redshifts, fluences, and break times lead to estimates of the jet angles θ ranging from 1° to 25° , with an aggregation near 4° . (The number of GRB’s with redshift determinations is currently ~ 40 . For an update of the work described in Frail et al. 2001, see Berger, Kulkarni, & Frail 2003.)

Prior investigations of GRB jet expansion have been largely analytical, or involved computational models with some imposed symmetry, typically spherical or axial (e.g., Rhoads 1997, 1999; Sari 1997, Sari, Piran, & Halpern 1999; Panaitescu & Mészáros 1999; Granot, Piran, & Sari 1999a; Kumar & Panaitescu 2000ab; Panaitescu & Kumar 2001ab, 2002; Granot et al. 2002). These works have tended for the most part to confirm estimates and scalings based on the analytical formalism of Blandford & McKee (1976=BM76), although for many of the studies the agreement is (to some extent) circular, given that they rely at least in part on the BM76 formalism. Kobayashi, Piran, & Sari (1999) present results based on a spherically symmetric relativistic Lagrangian code. They identify three regimes during the evolution of the GRB jet: (i) an acceleration phase during which $p \gg \rho$ and γ increases rapidly to a large value $\sim 10^2 - 10^4$, (ii) a coasting phase during which γ is relatively constant as the mass accumulated from the CSM is small compared to that in

the jet, and (iii) a deceleration phase during which the accumulated mass forces a rapid decrease in γ . Previous studies using analytical methods divided the evolution into regimes defined by some ordering of distance, velocity, or energy scales (see Table 3 of Piran 1999 and Figure 7 of Mészáros 2002). The main findings that seem to be common to all studies are that the break in the decaying light curve $d \log L(t)/d \log t$ occurs roughly when the deceleration has decreased γ to roughly the reciprocal of the jet beaming angle, and that the subsequent decrease in γ is roughly exponential with distance. Also, Panaitescu & Mészáros (1999) present axisymmetric calculations to study the combined effects of the transition from $\gamma^{-1} < \theta$ to $\gamma^{-1} > \theta$ and the lateral jet expansion.

In other subdisciplines of astronomy the use of relativistic hydrodynamics codes has been standard for some time. For example, workers studying extragalactic jets have used such codes to continuously inject a collimated supersonic beam into a surrounding medium, usually under the assumption of pressure equilibrium. (see, e.g., Norman et al. 1982 for a thorough discussion). In the context of GRBs, work has been done using 2D and 3D relativistic hydro codes to consider the evolution of the GRB jet as it propagates through the envelope of the progenitor star, up to the point where it breaks out of the stellar surface and produces the prompt GRB emission (Zhang, Woosley, & MacFadyen 2003, Zhang, Woosley, & Heger 2003). In this work we consider the evolution covering the afterglow time (i.e, after the period considered by Zhang et al. 2003ab). We utilize a three dimensional relativistic hydrodynamical code to study the propagation of an initially ultrarelativistic blob into a dense CSM. We study the spatial spreading of the blob both along the direction of propagation and orthogonal to it, as well as the evolution of γ in space and time. We also calculate afterglow light curves, taking a simple prescription in which the local emissivity scales with the local pressure.

2. Computational Model and Tests

The model used is that of Del Zanna & Bucciantini (2002=DB02). These authors present a simple and efficient numerical scheme for special relativistic hydrodynamics (SRHD) that does not rely on computationally expensive spectral decomposition (and the accompanying matrix inversions). The semi-discrete form of the SRHD equations is solved, so that time integration can be carried out using a standard Runge-Kutta method. Unlike many previous multidimensional calculations run on supercomputers, characteristic decomposition and Riemann solvers are not required. The only local pieces of information required are the highest characteristic speeds. The simplicity and efficiency of the model allow for runs to be carried out on a modern PC with ~ 2 GHz CPU speed and ~ 1 Gb RAM. We refer the reader to DB02 and to Londrillo & Del Zanna (2000) for the details. (Also, Del Zanna & Bucciantini 2003 add MHD to the SRHD formalism of DB02.) The basic idea is to calculate a vector of “fluxes” $\mathbf{f}$ that is then used within each time step to advance a vector of “conserved” variables $\mathbf{u}$ by computing the spatial divergences of the $\mathbf{f}$ ’s. The time integration is carried out with a third order Runge-Kutta scheme. The vector of “primitive” or physical variables $\mathbf{v} = [\rho, v^j, p]^T$ must be recovered from the conserved variables $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{v}) = [\rho\gamma, w\gamma^2 v^j, w\gamma^2 - p]^T$ in each Runge-Kutta step, and at each grid point. Primitive variables are reconstructed at the left (L) and right (R) cell faces using the “convex essentially non-oscillatory” interpolation described in DB02. This method gives third order accuracy by adaptively adjusting the “stencil”, or spatial interval, used for computing differences in the vicinity of a given cell. DB02 present two versions of the fluxes, $\mathbf{f}^{\text{HLL}}$, where “HLL” denotes Harten, Lax, & Van Leer (1983), that are precise but at the same time potentially prone to numerical instabilities, and $\mathbf{f}^{\text{LLF}}$, where “LLF” denotes local Lax-Friedrichs (cf. Lax & Liu 1998), that represent a smoother, numerically dissipative flux. For the main application we consider in this work we will utilize the LLF fluxes.

DB02 present a suite of test results for 1, 2, and 3 dimensions. We have reproduced these tests, and now show the results of a 3D spherical expansion that results in higher γ values than the tests discussed in DB02. We utilize a cubical grid of $100 \times 100 \times 100$ points, with each side having length unity.² Initial conditions are that everywhere $v^j = 0$, $\rho = 2$, and $p = 3 \times 10^5$ within a radius 0.1 of the center of the cube, and $p = 1$ outside. This is the 3D analog of the 1D “piston” problem. (An identical test with less extreme initial conditions is shown and discussed by Hughes, Miller, & Duncan 2002, see their Fig. 3.) The enormous over-pressure launches a relativistic blast wave at $t = 0$. Figure 1 shows the evolution of ρ , v_x , p , and γ for a slice taken along the x -axis. The density inside the sphere becomes small for late times. To avoid numerical instabilities in this region we utilize the smoother LLF fluxes for small densities ($\rho < 0.0225$), and the HLL fluxes elsewhere. We show the initial configuration plus 10 time slices from a run with 360 total time steps, taking a Courant number of 0.05. After the run begins one can see the development of a strong spherical outflow from the center of the cube. The Lorentz γ factor has increased to $\sim 20 - 30$ in the outer parts of the expanding shell by the end of the run. The run was halted before the expansion reached the edge of the grid. For the last three time steps, a kink develops in the v_x profile at the center of the sphere because of the prolonged spherical outflow from localized point. Figure 2 shows the corresponding evolution for pure LLF fluxes. All variables now show a smoother evolution and $\gamma \rightarrow 20$ at large radii for late times – somewhat less than for the HLL fluxes. Conservation of rest-mass energy $M \equiv \sum_i (\rho_i \gamma_i)$ and energy $E \equiv \sum_i (e_i \gamma_i^2 + p_i (\gamma_i^2 - 1))$ (where the specific energy $e_i = \rho_i + p_i / (\Gamma - 1)$)

²DB02 quote a CPU run time of ~ 2 minutes per Runge-Kutta integration for a 3D problem with 100^3 nodes, utilizing the third order reconstruction for the L and R values of the primitives, and using a 1 GHz Linux PC; our run time of ~ 70 s is consistent with the 1.7 GHz Linux PC used in this work.

integrated over the computational grid is as follows: By the end of the run shown in Fig. 1, M and E have increased by about 1 part in 10^4 ; by the end of the run shown in Fig. 2, M has increased by ~ 3 parts in 10^5 , and E is constant (to within machine accuracy).

3. Results

We now present results for the case of interest, namely a relativistic blob of material that expands roughly axisymmetrically (orthogonal to the direction of motion) as it decelerates from ultrarelativistic to relativistic speeds. We set up our initial problem as follows: our blob is made to propagate along the positive x -axis through a 3D rectangular grid of $500 \times 100 \times 100$ cells. The box measures 5 units along the x axis, and 1 unit each along the y and z axes. Therefore the grid spacing along each axis is 0.01 units. We explore a variety of configurations for our initial state. We performed runs in which the blob initially is either a small cone, sphere, or plate, with symmetry about the propagation vector. The dimensions of the initial blob are optimized, according to its shape, so that ~ 70 grid points out of the 5×10^6 in the computational domain initially comprise the blob. An initial spread is imparted to each fluid element by setting the y and z components of velocity such that $\theta = (v_y^2 + v_z^2)^{1/2}/v_x = 0.035$. The motivation for taking $\theta = 0.035$ is the study of Frail et al. (2001) that finds a peak in the frequency histogram distribution of inferred spreading angles θ from observed GRBs of 4° or 0.07 radian. We divide this value by two to obtain the half-angle spread 0.035 radian. The blob is given a Lorentz factor $\gamma = 25$ so that the relativistic beaming angle γ^{-1} lies within the physical spreading angle θ of the jet. We set $p_{\text{blob}}/\rho_{\text{blob}} = 10^{-4}$ (inside the blob), $p_{\text{CSM}}/\rho_{\text{CSM}} = 10^{-6}$ (outside the blob), and $\rho_{\text{blob}}/\rho_{\text{CSM}} = 10^2$. We also perform one trial with $\theta = 0$, i.e., $v_y = v_z = 0$ at all points. This is the “null hypothesis” run. The effective density contrast perceived in the lab (i.e., CSM) frame is $(\rho_{\text{blob}}/\rho_{\text{CSM}})\gamma_{\text{blob}}$. Soon after the computation starts, the initial profile

relaxes to one in which $\rho_{\text{blob}}/\rho_{\text{CSM}} \simeq 10$, therefore the effective density contrast for the early run is ~ 200 . This is less than expected astrophysically, but required in our computations in order to see significant deceleration of the blob by the time it reaches the end of the grid $x = 5$. In other words, we must telescope the evolution into the finite dimensions of our grid. From conservation of momentum, the condition for significant deceleration is that the total swept-up mass-energy roughly equals that in the initial blob.

Experimentation using HLL fluxes shows that strong internal shocks almost immediately create large-amplitude sawtooth ρ variations within the blob, leading to noisy results. Therefore we utilize the smoother LLF fluxes in this work. We follow the evolution of the blob in terms of both its motion in x and its spreading in y and z . Taking a Courant number of 0.25 necessitates ~ 2000 time steps for the blob to reach the end of the grid, traveling at $v_x \simeq 1$. This is a simple consequence of the box length and grid spacing $\Delta x = 0.01$, from which it follows that the time to traverse the box is $2000 \times 0.25 \times 0.01 = 5$ units traveling at $v \simeq 1$. A density contrast of $\sim 10^2$ is sufficient to see the desired deceleration from $\gamma^{-1} < \theta$ to $\gamma^{-1} > \theta$ during a run.

In order to avoid undue complexity in these experiments, that currently are purely hydrodynamic and do not yet contain proper prescriptions for emission from bremsstrahlung and synchrotron processes, we calculate a simple measure of the emissivity by taking the local emission to scale as p , which would be expected roughly for optically thin synchrotron emission characteristic of frequencies significantly above the self-absorption frequency. We avoid the issues of synchrotron self-absorption (Granot, Piran, & Sari 1999b, 2000; Panaitescu & Kumar 2000; Sari & Esin 2001), and of whether the evolution is adiabatic or radiative (Panaitescu & Mészáros 1998b; Sari, Piran, & Narayan 1998) — our calculations are adiabatic. We calculate effective “light curves” for observers at various viewing angles between 0° and 15° from the center of the jet. The amplification of the photon energy flux is

dictated by three factors: (1) The rate of photon emission is increased by a factor of γ as one goes from the blob frame to the lab frame. (2) The individual photons are Doppler-shifted so that their lab frame energy is increased by a factor of $\gamma(1 + \beta \cos \phi)$, where ϕ is the angle between the line of sight and blob’s direction of motion. (3) The photons are focused in the direction of motion, so that an angle of emission (relative to the direction of motion) in the blob’s frame, ϕ' , is related to the lab frame angle ϕ by $\cos \phi' = (\cos \phi - \beta)/(1 - \beta \cos \phi)$. The differential solid angle $d(\cos \phi') = d(\cos \phi)[(1 - \beta^2)/(1 - \beta \cos \phi)^2]$. Thus, the net amplification of the photon energy flux for each fluid element is $(1 + \beta \cos \phi)/(1 - \beta \cos \phi)^2$. Similar expressions have been derived previously (e.g., Granot, Piran, & Sari 1999a, eqns. [3], [4]; Wang, & Loeb 2001, eqns. [13], [31]). The formalisms of Granot et al (1999a) and Wang & Loeb (2001) also contain a provision for time delays based on the relative positions and velocities of different fluid elements. The “time” of interest in summing the relative emission contributions is the retarded time $t - r \cos \phi/c$. We compute light curves by keeping running totals of the contributions to the flux from 100 slices through the computational domain (straddling the position of local disturbance in the fluid caused by the advancing blob) that are orthogonal to the blob velocity vector (i.e., cuts in the $y - z$ plane) and advance in time toward the observer at c . Over the course of a run we build up a light curve based on constant retarded times with respect to the observer. This approach is essential insofar as the photons emitted by a given fluid element outpace the blob itself only slightly.

Figure 3 shows the evolution of physical quantities for the run which begins with a small cone along a cut through the center of the computational box, along the direction of propagation of the blob. The initial conditions quickly disappear and give way to the deceleration phase noted by Kobayashi et al. (1999). During the entire evolution there is a local maximum in p in advance of the propagating blob that accompanies the leading pile-up in density. The region of highest γ lies within the density minimum that lies just

behind this shocked region. Although the initial pressure is small, after the bow shock is fully developed we have $p_{\text{shock}}/\rho_{\text{shock}} \simeq 0.3$ throughout the subsequent evolution. The evolution proceeds in a roughly self-similar manner and the forward/reverse shock system is stable, in accord with analytic estimates (Wang, Loeb, & Waxman 2002).

Figures 4 and 5 show a time series of contour plots in γ and ρ that follow the blob propagation and radial spreading. The full 500 grid points along the x direction are shown, and each frame represents 240 time steps (i.e., $\Delta t = 0.6$). The leading contours show the density enhancement associated with the shock. The ρ contours indicate the values 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, and 0.5, while the (trailing) γ contours, indicate values of 1.25, 2.5, 5, 10, 15, and 20. The contours are formed by taking a cut at $z = 0$ through the $x - y$ plane. The initial velocity vector of the blob points toward the top of the plot, with $\gamma = 25$. One sees a strong bow shock associated with the maximum in pressure at the point where the blob encounters the CSM. The lack of a bow shock in the γ contours suggests that little or no material in advance of the blob is accelerated to a significant bulk Lorentz factor. As the evolution progresses the deceleration causes the higher γ contours to disappear, and those that remain become increasingly distorted. The bilateral symmetry of the contours evident in Figures 4 and 5 attests to the power of the third order differencing scheme given in DB02, insofar as the 3D model has no enforced symmetry.

Figure 6 shows the evolution of the total rest-mass energy M (dotted) and total energy E (dashed) within the grid, over the course of the conical run. The values of M and E have been normalized to their initial values. The curves that extend significantly below an abscissa value of unity indicate the values summed over the grid. At the six faces of the computational box we continually reset the values of all variables to their initial values, and keep track of the differences between those values and the initial ones. As the run progresses and more high velocity gas reaches the edge of the computational domain and is extracted,

there is a net extraction of positive M and E from the grid. In addition, there is a low density wake that trails the blob, and therefore at the contact points between the wake and the sides of the grid there is a net extraction of negative M and E . From a practical standpoint, the density inside the wake is so small that the net extraction of negative M and E does not significantly affect the bookkeeping. The curves in Figure 6 that lie close to an abscissa value of unity indicate the summed values for M and E corrected for both net extracted positive and negative rest-mass energies. The second panel of Figure 6 gives an expanded view of the first panel around the abscissa value of unity. After doing the bookkeeping on the M and E in the extracted gas, conservation of total rest-mass energy and total energy are good to within $\sim 1 - 2$ parts in 10^3 .

Figure 7 shows values of total rest-mass energy within selected high γ cuts through the computational domain for the initially conical run, and the evolution of the x -component of momentum $\langle \gamma v_x \rangle$ for five different runs – the initial blob as a plate (“P1” and “P2”), sphere (“S”), cone (“C”), and cone with zero spreading (“ $v_T(0) = 0$ ”). The weighting function used in evaluating $\langle \gamma v_x \rangle$ is $W(\gamma) = (\gamma^2 - 1)\rho\gamma$. The run P2 uses fewer grid points (500×50^2) than the other runs, thus material shunted aside by the bow shock reaches the edges of the computational domain earlier. In spite of this, the evolution of P1 and P2 is quite similar, i.e., there is no dynamically significant back reaction on the material inside the computational domain induced by the departing fluid. As we detail in the Discussion section, the drag force on the blob increases as the effective area presented by the blob, which for a roughly constant lateral spreading goes as x^2 . Therefore the integral of the relativistic impulse equation $d(M_{\text{blob}}\gamma_{\text{blob}}v_x)/dt = F_{\text{drag}}$ provides a solution of the form $\langle \gamma v_x \rangle \simeq a - b(x + c)^3$, where our fitting for the conical run ($a = 21$, $b = 0.15$, and $c = 0.45$) is shown by the curve labeled “ $f(x)$ ”.

The curves in Figure 7 showing the variation of the rest-mass energy contained within

different γ cuts follow the values $\gamma_{\text{cut}} = 1.001, 1.01, 1.1, 1.5, 2, 4, 6$, and 8. The higher γ cuts $\gamma_{\text{cut}} \gtrsim 2$ reveal that a negligible fraction of CSM matter gets accelerated to significant values. This is because the curved bow shock shunts material laterally in front of the advancing blob, rather than accelerating it up to a significant fraction of the blob's bulk Lorentz factor $\sim 10 - 20$. The rest-mass energy curves are relatively constant in time up to $t \simeq 2$. At roughly this point the total accumulated CSM gas becomes comparable to that in the initial blob. If the blob did not spread laterally, this time would occur when the blob had plowed through a density $\sim \gamma_{\text{initial}}(\rho_{\text{blob}}/\rho_{\text{CSM}})$, where $\gamma_{\text{initial}} = 20$ and $\rho_{\text{blob}}/\rho_{\text{CSM}} \simeq 10$. This means that the blob would have shed of order its initial momentum by the time it had traveled ~ 200 times its initial length $\sim \delta x = 0.1$, or ~ 20 units. In practice, the initially imposed tangential velocity v_T leads to the lateral expansion that effectively increases the cross section for interaction of the blob. The negligible decrease in $\langle \gamma v_x \rangle$ for the $v_T(0) = 0$ run demonstrates the importance of this effect.

Figure 8 shows the lateral expansion of the blob for the conical run. The blob edge is computed in each time step by first finding the local maximum in either ρ , γ , or $\rho\gamma$ along the x -axis, and then stepping laterally to the position at which the background (CSM) value of the relevant quantity has been increased by 10% due to expansion of the blob. The transient lateral expansion $v_{\text{edge}} \simeq 0.3 - 0.4c$ lasting until $x \simeq 1$ is unphysical insofar as it occurs during the period of adjustment to the initial density and velocity profiles. The value of the later spreading rate $v_{\text{edge}} \simeq 0.1c$ is basically dictated by the initial v_T value given to the gas.

Figure 9 shows the evolution of $\langle \gamma v_x \rangle$ and θ as the blob propagates. The solid curve in the top panel indicates the same weighted value of $\langle \gamma v_x \rangle$ as shown in Fig. 7. After the transient physical conditions associated with the initial state have vanished, one sees a period of deceleration associated with the increasing drag force. The dashed curves indicate

the reciprocal of the full width spreading angle determined by summing and averaging the local values of $2(v_y^2 + v_z^2)^{1/2}/v_x$. Due to the complicated pattern of spreading and the mismatch between contours of constant ρ and constant γ , the specific value for $\langle \theta \rangle$ depends on where one cuts off the outer edge of the blob. The three dashed curves use limiting lower values of 4, 5 and 6, respectively, for the γ value, in determining the volume averages that enter into $\langle \theta \rangle$. The spherical/jetlike transition occurs when $\gamma_{\max}$ drops below the $\langle \theta \rangle$ value computed using the lower limit $\gamma_{\text{cut}} = 6$. The bottom panel shows the number of cells used in computing the $\langle \theta \rangle$ values. At late times the disappearance of higher velocity matter makes problematic a calculation of $\langle \theta \rangle$ based on cuts in γ .

Figure 10 shows the evolution of our canonical “luminosity” measure, namely $\Sigma_i p_i (1 + \beta_i \cos \phi) / (1 - \beta_i \cos \phi)^2$, for various viewing angles ϕ . As noted previously, the light curves are calculated by summing the emission from all points with the computational domain that lie, in a given time step, on 100 $y - z$ planes which straddle the position of the blob and advance toward the observer at c . One sees a slight break in the “light curve” for the $\phi = 0^\circ$ observer at $\Delta \log t(x) \approx -0.3$ due to the transition from spherical to jetlike expansion. Although our model is too simple to allow any detailed quantitative comparison with observations at this point, it is worth noting that many of the observed afterglow transitions are also smooth (e.g., Fig. 2 of Stanek et al. 1999; Fig. 1 of Harrison et al. 1999), rather than the abrupt breaks evident in some of the semi-analytical models. The transition is not so visible for off-axis viewing angles. The general pattern in which increasingly off-axis observers see significantly lower emission until well past maximum light curve can be seen in the light curves shown in Fig. 4b of Panaitescu & Mészáros (1999). Afterglows coming from those GRBs for which the observer does not lie within the initial cone of GRB emission are referred to “orphan” afterglows. Future surveys of orphan afterglows might provide constraints on the beaming that are different from those of Frail et al. (2001, e.g., Totani & Panaitescu 2002; Levinson, Ofek, Waxman, & Gal-Yam 2002).

4. Discussion

Utilizing 3D relativistic hydrodynamical calculations, we have examined the evolution of an expanding relativistic blob of gas intended to be representative of a jet associated with ejecta from an extremely energetic event such as a hypernova, that produces a gamma-ray burst (Aloy et al. 2000; Tan, Matzner, & McKee 2001; MacFadyen, Woosley, & Heger 2001, Zhang, Woosley, & Heger 2003, Zhang, Woosley, & MacFadyen 2003). Since these are the first such calculations applied to the blob during the time in which the afterglow radiation is produced, we have purposely kept them simple in an effort to concentrate on the most fundamental aspects of the physics. We restrict our attention to the transition from spherical to jetlike expansion that occurs during the time that the Lorentz factor becomes less than the reciprocal of the jet spreading angle.

We have not yet attached specific numbers to our results. From the SRHD equations, one sees that the relevant quantities are the ratios of pressure to density, and of distance to time. If we specify either one of these two sets of numbers, the other one is also determined. The column giving the observed afterglow break time t_j in Table 1 of Frail et al. (2001) indicates $t_j \simeq 2$ d as being representative. For an observer directly on the velocity vector of the blob, the time T between the GRB and afterglow

$$T = \int \delta t = \int_{t_{\text{GRB}}}^{t_{\text{afterglow}}} \left(\frac{\delta x}{v(x)} - \frac{\delta x}{c} \right) = \frac{1}{c} \int \delta x \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma^{-2}}} - 1 \right] \simeq \frac{1}{2c} \int \delta x \gamma(x)^{-2},$$

where the dominant contribution to the integral comes from later times. Thus the light travel time of 1 day is multiplied by $\sim 2\gamma_{\text{afterglow}}^2 \simeq 2 \times 10^2$, assuming the spherical-to-jetlike transition giving the break in the afterglow light curve happens at $\gamma \simeq 10$. For the conical run, the break in the light curve occurs at $x \simeq 2.5$. If we designate this point as corresponding to a time 2 d, then $x = 2.5$ translates to $ct_j \simeq 5.2 \times 10^{15}(200)$ cm $\simeq 10^{18}$

cm. Since we have 100 grid points per unit length, this means each grid point spacing corresponds to $\sim 1 \times 10^{16}$ cm.

Zhang, Woosley, & MacFadyen (2003) utilize a 2D relativistic hydrodynamics code to follow the evolution of the blob through the envelope of the progenitor star and past the point of “break-out” through the stellar surface. They find that a blob launched at $r = 2000$ km with an initial spreading angle of $\theta_{\text{initial}} = 20^\circ$ and a bulk Lorentz factor of 50 experiences strong shock heating and also lateral confinement, so that when it emerges from the progenitor it has a large internal energy $p/\rho \simeq 10$, a bulk Lorentz factor ~ 10 , and is more confined than initially ($\theta_{\text{final}} \sim 5^\circ$). The subsequent expansion due to the large p/ρ value leads to an effective $\gamma \simeq 2\gamma_{\text{bulk}}\gamma_{\text{thermal}} \simeq 200$ for a distant observer. In the standard model for GRBs, the gamma radiation is produced by strong internal shocks in the expanding fireball at the point where it becomes optically thin to its own radiation, at $\sim 6 \times 10^6 (E_{51}/n_0)^{1/3}$ s, where E_{51} is the total energy carried by the jet, corrected for beaming, in units of 10^{51} ergs, and n_0 is the CSM density in units of 1 cm^{-3} . During the time of gamma ray emission, the bulk Lorentz factor of the ejecta $\gamma \simeq 100 - 300$. Zhang, Woosley, & Heger (2003) compute the evolution after break-out covering the time of the prompt GRB emission. They estimate it should occur at about 3×10^{14} to 3×10^{15} cm and have a duration $\sim r/(2\gamma^2 c) \simeq 10 - 10^2$ s. In this work we focus on the time after this event, i.e., subsequent to the evolution considered by Zhang et al. (2003ab), when the “afterglow” is produced. This emission is thought to arise primarily in the bow shock where the strong heating leads to $p_{\text{shock}} \simeq \rho_{\text{shock}}$ (Wang & Loeb 2001). In essence, this energy production arises from “external shocks”, as opposed to the “internal shocks” that generate the gamma radiation (Rees & Mészáros 1994; Panaitescu, & Mészáros 1998a; Spada, Panaitescu, & Mészáros 2000, Kobayashi & Sari 2001).

After the blob is ejected from the envelope of the star that was the hypernova

precursor and continues to propagate, the medium through which it travels should be dominated by the density profile left from the precursor’s stellar wind (Chevalier & Li 1999, 2000, Li & Chevalier 2001). If the density varies as r^{-2} away from the star, the mass loss of the wind $\dot{M}_{\text{wind}} \simeq 10^{-5} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, and the wind velocity $v_{\text{wind}} \simeq 10^3 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, the circumstellar density at the point where the afterglow radiation is emitted $\sim 10^{18} \text{ cm}$ will be $n_{\text{CSM}} \sim \dot{M}_{\text{wind}} / (4\pi r^2 v_{\text{wind}} m_p) \simeq 0.3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. In the calculation of Zhang et al (2003), the density inside the jet is $\sim 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ at $\sim 10^{12} \text{ cm}$, and $p \simeq \rho$. If the spreading angle of the jet remains roughly constant from $\sim 10^{12} \text{ cm}$ to $\sim 10^{18} \text{ cm}$ (Lithwick & Sari 2001), then the density inside the jet at $\sim 10^{18} \text{ cm}$ should be lower by $\sim (r_2/r_1)^2 \simeq 10^{12}$, or about $\sim 10^5 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. At this point p inside the jet should be negligible compared to ρ . The density contrast between the blob and CSM is greater than what we have assumed in the results shown previously. A separate run taking an initial density contrast of 10^6 shows the same basic effects as the previous runs, however, namely a lateral expansion rate of $\sim 0.1c$ and the non-accretion of CSM gas.

Our computations lie within the “deceleration phase” discussed by Kobayashi et al. (1999, see also Kobayashi & Sari 2000, 2001). We find a change in the form of the luminosity decrease corresponding to the transition between spherical and jetlike expansion. The determination of the average spreading angle $\langle \theta \rangle$ is nontrivial because it depends on how one does the averaging, and how much of the diffuse, sideways-expanding jet material is included in the computation. In Figure 9 we presented cuts for gas possessing $\gamma > \gamma_{\text{cut}} = 4, 5$, and 6 as representative of material in the flow that partakes most strongly in producing the observed radiation. We do not see a dramatic increase in $\langle \theta \rangle$ during the deceleration phase; the $\langle \theta \rangle$ value basically reflects the ballistic motion of material following its initial v_T value. Also, because the deceleration in our problem is forced not by the accumulation of gas from the CSM but rather the drag force of the CSM on the blob, we do not see an exponential decrease in γ with distance during the deceleration phase, but rather a decrease

well-approximated by a cubic dependence that is expected for a roughly constant lateral spreading rate.

Many of the previous studies, utilizing the formalism of BM76 in which matter accreted from the CSM is added onto the GRB shell and facilitates the deceleration, have discussed the sideways expansion of the jet that supposedly occurs near the time that most of the initial kinetic energy of the blob has been shed. (A qualitative depiction of this effect is shown in Fig. 1 of Piran 2002.) Our results do not appear to support this viewpoint. We find that the CSM gas hitting the bow shock does not add significantly to the mass of the jet, but rather is swept back into its wake as the blob passes a given location. In this sense, the relevant factor in determining the deceleration is simply the projected CSM surface density relative to that in the blob. As a result, there is no runaway phase of rapid lateral expansion – a physical process that has been “built in” to some previous theories. We do not see an abrupt jump in the lateral spreading coincident with the deceleration phase; the lateral spreading rate is mandated basically by the initial v_T value imparted to the gas. The pressure-driven lateral expansion is negligible until such time as $v_{\text{spread}} < c_s/\gamma$, which for $c_s \simeq v_{\text{spread}}$ is so late as to be uninteresting. In the aforementioned works there is a close connection between the transition $v_{\text{spread}} \sim c_s/\gamma$ and the change from spherical to jetlike emission, whereas in our study there is not. The break in the light curve produced by emission from the bow shock is due solely to the lessening of relativistic beaming brought about by a slow, uniformly increasing drag from the CSM, and the fact that once γ^{-1} becomes less than θ , the observer perceives the finite width of the jet.

Rhoads (1999) estimates that the lateral spreading speed of the jet should be $v_{\text{edge}} \simeq c/\sqrt{3}$. Sari, Piran, & Halpern (1999) argue for a faster spreading rate $v_{\text{edge}} \simeq c$. Rhoads (1999) divides the dynamical evolution of the blob into two regimes, characterized by a power law decay (in time) of the bulk Lorentz factor, followed by an exponential decay.

During the latter stage, the swept-up mass increases exponentially in time. Panaitescu & Mészáros (1999) calculate light curves for observers at varying angles from the jet axis, and calculate separately the effects of including and excluding the lateral jet expansion. They find that the maxima in the light curves occur substantially later in runs which do not take into account the jet broadening (see their Fig. 4). In the analytical models of both Rhoads (1999) and Panaitescu & Mészáros (1999), the physics of mass accumulation from the CSM is an integral component of the formalism; all mass within the solid angle of the expanding shell is assumed to accrete. Workers have applied the results of Rhoads (1999) and Sari, Piran, & Halpern (1999) to the afterglow evolution, however the results of Zhang et al. (2003) cast doubt on the validity of this exercise, because at the time corresponding to the afterglow emission one anticipates that $p \ll \rho$ and the lateral spreading rate would not be governed by the internal sound speed but rather the ballistic motions of the ejecta comprising the blob as they leave the vicinity of the progenitor star. The blob has a large internal thermal energy $p/\rho \simeq 10$ as it emerges from the progenitor star, and even by the time the expanding ejecta have become optically thin to their own emission from internal shocks (producing the GRB), one still expects $p/\rho \simeq 1$. By the (much later) time of the afterglow emission, however, the blob would have cooled to the point that $p/\rho \ll 1$, which provides the impetus for our initial condition $p_{\text{blob}}/\rho_{\text{blob}} = 10^{-4}$. Following the arguments of Rhoads (1999) and Sari, Piran, & Halpern (1999), if the lateral spreading rate were mandated by the internal sound speed, then in our calculations it should be $\sim \sqrt{p/\rho} = 0.01c$, whereas we find it to be ~ 10 times larger. The spreading rate basically reflects our initial v_T value. Thus the physics of the lateral expansion is different than in Rhoads (1999) and Sari, Piran, & Halpern (1999). How might this result be influenced by systematic effects present in our model? One obvious potential shortcoming is the absence of cooling. In this work we have assumed an adiabatic gas, whereas in reality one might envision the presence of cooling within the shock. This might then reduce the ability of

the shock to deflect the gas as efficiently as it now does, which in our model prevents the acceleration of CSM material to Lorentz factors approaching that of the blob.

We adopt a relatively small density contrast between material inside the blob and the exterior CSM in order to see significant evolution of the blob during the course of the simulation within our Eulerian grid. We have run additional models using $\rho_{\text{blob}}/\rho_{\text{CSM}} = 10^6 - 10^8$, and although these could not be run for sufficient time to see the deceleration phase begin, we find in these runs also a lateral spreading rate $\sim 0.1c$, for the same initial v_T values, and negligible accretion of gas from the CSM.

We may understand the deceleration of the blob with a simple analytical model. If we assume that the only significant contribution to γ_{blob} is through forward motion, that the drag force varies as v^2 , and that $p_{\text{blob}} \ll \rho_{\text{blob}}$, then $\partial_t(M_{\text{blob}}\gamma_{\text{blob}}v_x) = F_{\text{drag}}$ implies

$$\partial_t(M_{\text{blob}}U) = -Kv_x^2\sigma\rho_{\text{CSM}}/c,$$

where $U \equiv \gamma_{\text{blob}}v_x/c$, σ is the cross sectional area for interaction $\pi(v_{\text{spread}}t + r_0)^2$, v_{spread} is the (constant) lateral spreading speed ($\sim 0.1c$ in our calculations), and K is a dimensionless number (typically of order 0.2 in laboratory applications). Taking $\partial_t = v_x\partial_x$ and $c = 1$ gives

$$\partial_x(U) = -Kv_x\sigma\rho_{\text{CSM}}/M_{\text{blob}},$$

where the blob mass $M_{\text{blob}} = \gamma_{\text{blob}}\rho_{\text{blob}}V_{\text{blob}}$. The blob volume is given by the number of cells comprising the blob initially (~ 70) times the volume of an element $\Delta x\Delta y\Delta z = (0.01)^3 = 10^{-6}$. Therefore $M_{\text{blob}} = (25)(10^2)(70)(10^{-6}) = 0.17$. Integrating gives

$$U(t) = U_0 - a(x + b)^3v_x,$$

where U_0 is the initial value of U and $a = (K/3)\rho_{\text{CSM}}\sigma/M_{\text{blob}}$. From the fitting to $\langle U \rangle$ presented in Figure 7, we infer that $K \simeq 2.4$. The specific numerical value for K is probably influenced by our numerical resolution. A comparison of the curves labelled “C” and “ $f(x)$ ” in Fig. 7 shows that the functional decrease in $\langle U \rangle$ with x is reasonably described by a cubic, as expected if the cross sectional area increases quadratically with x , or equivalently t . Note that we assumed $v_x = 1$ in this exercise, which is a good approximation for the evolution of interest.

5. Conclusion

The calculations we present are the first 3D relativistic hydrodynamical calculations of GRB jet evolution pertinent to the afterglow phase that do not enforce any special symmetry (e.g., spherical or axial). We find that (i) the CSM gas does not accrete onto the advancing blob, but rather is shunted aside by the bow shock, (ii) the decay light curve steepens roughly when one first “sees” the edge of the jet $\gamma^{-1} \approx \theta$, with this effect being strongest for “face-on” observers (confirming previous studies), and (iii) the rate of decrease of the x -component of momentum $\langle \gamma v_x \rangle$ is well-characterized by a simple model in which the cross sectional area of the blob increases quadratically with laboratory time (or distance). The primary impetus for the built-in assumption of accretion of matter in previous studies was the influential work of BM76 in which spherical relativistic expansion was considered. Accretion of gas onto the relativistically expanding shell is obviously justified for spherical expansion, but subsequent GRB workers applied the results to the case of the GRB jet, in which a thin wedge of material propagates through a low density medium. In such a situation the natural tendency of material in front of the jet is to be pushed aside and to form a “channel flow” around the jet, rather than to accrete. A separate issue is that workers used the results of Rhoads (1999) and Sari et al. (1999) that

give lateral expansion rates of order c to explain the phase of afterglow evolution, while it now turns out from the work of Zhang et al. (2003ab) that the much smaller internal energy in the afterglow-producing blob would be expected to give a much lower spreading rate, were that the only relevant spreading mechanism. The evolution of the blob prior to the afterglow epoch, however, in particular its emergence from the progenitor envelope, did encompass a period of much greater p/ρ during which a large v_{spread} was imparted to the gas. In summary, there is nothing in our results to suggest that BM76, Rhoads (1999), and Sari et al. (1999) are not internally consistent, rather it appears that the subsequent application of their results to afterglow evolution may have been inappropriate.

Recent semi-analytical work has centered on “structured” relativistic jet modeling, wherein one replaces the “top-hat” assumption of uniform jet properties, e.g., Lorentz factor and p/ρ constant within the initial cone angle, with more physically motivated forms in which the physical parameters vary with angle away from the jet symmetry axis ϕ (e.g., Kumar & Granot 2003, Granot & Kumar 2003). Structured jets represent a refinement in the semi-analytical and analytical work in the sense that unphysical artifacts of the top-hat models are avoided. In this work we allow naturally occurring gradients within the flow determine the evolution. In comparing the runs with different starting conditions, for instance, we see that only the gross initial characteristics (bulk Lorentz factor and spreading rate) are of relevance. One could impose a structured initial state, in terms of having an angle-dependent relation between, for instance Lorentz factor and ϕ , and/or p/ρ and ϕ , but one suspects that the initial intricacies would be washed out, just as the initial blob shape is. One might in fact imagine inverting the problem and using our results to determine physically motivated functional forms for $\gamma(\phi)$ and $p(\phi)/\rho(\phi)$ as input to a structured jet formalism, but in our models the detailed evolution of the physical parameters and the interaction of the blob with the bow shock reveal gross changes along the jet axis. Therefore the motivation for trying to characterize the jet properties as simple functions of

ϕ , averaged along the axis of the jet, seems questionable. In addition, one would still be missing important physical effects, such as the non-accretion of the forward CSM material.

Two obvious refinements, currently being carried out, are to (i) treat the problem on a Lagrangian grid in which the mesh points follow the blob and are adaptively inserted in regions with strong gradients, so as to be able to explore regimes in which the density contrast between the blob and CSM is much larger, and (ii) include provisions for realistic bremsstrahlung and synchrotron physics, in order to produce light curves that can be compared directly with observations so as to test different aspects of the theory and thereby constrain the allowed parameter space.

Our sincerest thanks go to Luca Del Zanna who provided key insights into the workings of DB02. We also thank John Baker, David Band, Tom Cline, Chris Fragile, Chris Fryer, Markos Georganopoulos, Peter Goldreich, Demos Kazanas, Pawan Kumar, Zhi-Yun Li, Andrew MacFadyen, Peter Mészáros, Ewald Mueller, Jay Norris, Alin Panaitescu, Sterl Phinney, Steve Reynolds, James Rhoads, Steve Ruden, Sabrina Savage, Craig Wheeler, and Weiqun Zhang for helpful comments.

REFERENCES

- Aloy, M. A., Mueller, E., Ibanez, J. M., Marti, J. M., & MacFadyen, A. 2000, *ApJ*, 531, L119
- Berger, E., Kulkarni, S. R., & Frail, D. A. 2003, *ApJ*, 590, 379
- Blandford, R. D., & McKee, C. F. 1976, *Phys. Fluids*, 19, 1130 (BM76)
- Chevalier, R. A., & Li, Z.-Y. 1999, *ApJ*, 520, L29
- Chevalier, R. A., & Li, Z.-Y. 2000, *ApJ*, 536, 195
- Costa, E., et al. 1997, *Nature*, 387, 783
- Del Zanna, L., & Bucciantini, N. 2002, *A&A*, 390, 1177 (DB02)
- Del Zanna, L., Bucciantini, N., & Londrillo, P. 2003, *A&A*, 400, 397
- Frail, D. A., et al. 2001, *ApJ*, 562, L55
- Granot, J., & Kumar, P. 2003, *ApJ*, 591, 1086
- Granot, J., Panaitescu, A., Kumar, P., & Woosley, S. E. 2002, *ApJ*, 570, L161
- Granot, J., Piran, T., & Sari, R. 1999a, *ApJ*, 513, 679
- Granot, J., Piran, T., & Sari, R. 1999b, *ApJ*, 527, 236
- Granot, J., Piran, T., & Sari, R. 2000, *ApJ*, 534, L163
- Granot, J., & Sari, R. 2002, *ApJ*, 568, 820
- Harrison, F. A., et al. 1999, *ApJ*, 523, L121
- Harten, A., Lax, P., & Van Leer, B. 1983, *SIAM Rev.*, 25, 35
- Hughes, P. A., Miller, M. A., & Duncan, G. C. 2002, *ApJ*, 572, 713
- Kobayashi, S., Piran, T., & Sari, R. 1999, *ApJ*, 513, 669
- Kobayashi, S., & Sari, R. 2000, *ApJ*, 542, 819

- Kobayashi, S., & Sari, R. 2001, *ApJ*, 551, 934
- Kumar, P., & Granot, J. 2003, *ApJ*, 591, 1075
- Kumar, P., & Panaitescu, A. 2000a, *ApJ*, 541, L9
- Kumar, P., & Panaitescu, A. 2000b, *ApJ*, 541, L51
- Lax, P. D., & Liu, X.-D. 1998, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 19, 319
- Levinson, A., Ofek, E. O., Waxman, E., & Gal-Yam, A. 2002, *ApJ*, 576, 923
- Li, Z.-Y., & Chevalier, R. A., 2001, *ApJ*, 551, 940
- Lithwick, Y., & Sari, R. 2001, *ApJ*, 555, 540
- Londrillo, P., & Del Zanna, L. 2000, *ApJ*, 530, 508
- MacFadyen, A. I., Woosley, S. E., & Heger, A. 2001, *ApJ*, 550, 410
- Mészáros, P., & Rees, M. J. 1997, *ApJ*, 476, 232
- Mészáros, P. 2002, *ARAA*, 40, 137
- Norman, M. L., Winkler, K.-H. A., Smarr, L., & Smith, M. D. 1982, *A&A*, 113, 285
- Panaitescu, A., & Kumar, P. 2000, 543, 66
- Panaitescu, A., & Kumar, P. 2001a, 554, 667
- Panaitescu, A., & Kumar, P. 2001b, 560, L49
- Panaitescu, A., & Kumar, P. 2002, 571, 779
- Panaitescu, A., & Mészáros, P. 1998a, *ApJ*, 492, 683
- Panaitescu, A., & Mészáros, P. 1998b, *ApJ*, 501, 772
- Panaitescu, A., & Mészáros, P. 1999, *ApJ*, 526, 707
- Panaitescu, A., Mészáros, P., & Rees, M. J. 1998, *ApJ*, 503, 314
- Piran, T. 1999, *Physics Reports*, 314, 575

- Piran, T. 2002, *Science*, 295, 986
- Piran, T., Kumar, P., Panaitescu, A., & Piro, L. 2001, *ApJ*, 560, L167
- Rees, M. J., & Mészáros, P. 1994, *ApJ*, 430, L93
- Rhoads, J. E. 1997, *ApJ*, 487, L1
- Rhoads, J. E. 1999, *ApJ*, 525, 737
- Sari, R. 1997, *ApJ*, 489, L37
- Sari, R., & Esin, A. A. 2001, *ApJ*, 548, 787
- Sari, R., Piran, T., & Halpern, J. P. 1999, *ApJ*, 519, L17
- Sari, R., Piran, T., & Narayan, R. 1998, *ApJ*, 497, L17
- Spada, M., Panaitescu, A., & Mészáros, P. 2000, *ApJ*, 537, 824
- Stanek, K. Z., Garnavich, P. M., Kaluzny, J., Pych, W., & Thompson, I. 1999, *ApJ*, 522, L39
- Tan, J. C., Matzner, C. D., & McKee, C. F. 2001, *ApJ*, 551, 946
- Totani, T., & Panaitescu, A. 2002, *ApJ*, 576, 120
- van Paradijs, J., et al. 1997, *Nature*, 386, 686
- van Paradijs, J., Kouveliotou, C., & Wijers, R. A. M. J. 2000, *ARAA*, 38, 379
- Wang, X., & Loeb, A. 2001, *ApJ*, 552, 49
- Wang, X., & Loeb, A., & Waxman, E. 2002, *ApJ*, 568, 830
- Wijers, R. A. M. J., Rees, M. J., & Mészáros, P. 1997, *MNRAS*, 288, L51
- Zhang, W., Woosley, S. E., & MacFadyen, A. I. 2003, *ApJ*, 586, 356
- Zhang, W., Woosley, S. E., & Heger, A. 2003, *astro-ph/0308389*

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. The evolution of a spherical relativistic expansion due to a large over-pressure inside a sphere of radius 0.1, adopting HLL fluxes. The evolution encompasses 360 time steps, taking a Courant number of 0.05. Shown are the initial conditions plus ten equally spaced time steps taken from a slice along the x -axis depicting the evolution of (i) pressure p (*top panel*), (ii) density ρ (*second panel*), (iii) v_x/c (*third panel*), and (iv) Lorentz factor γ (*bottom panel*). The small numbers beside each curve indicate the evolution. One sees an expansion of the central over-pressurized sphere into the surrounding medium. The strong relativistic outflow peaks at $\gamma \simeq 20 - 30$ near the end of the evolution. The general trend in which $\gamma \propto r$ within the expansion can be derived from fundamental principles and is well known from classical solutions. At late times the strong decrease in ρ at the center of the sphere, which is a singularity in this test, begins to cause numerical instability. We utilize the LLF fluxes for $\rho < 0.0225$ and the HLL fluxes for $\rho \geq 0.0225$.

Figure 2. The evolution of a spherical relativistic expansion due to a large over-pressure inside a sphere of radius 0.1, adopting pure LLF fluxes. Quantities shown are the same as in Fig. 1. The evolution is nearly identical to that in Fig. 1, except the variations in the physical variables are smoother, and $\gamma \simeq 20$ at larger radii by the end of the run – somewhat smaller than in Fig. 1.

Figure 3. The evolution of a relativistic blob launched as a small cone traveling along the $+x$ -axis, initially confined to between $x = 0.1375$ and $x = 0.2$ and a maximum radius 0.025. The small numbers beside each curve indicate the time step. The panels are the same as shown in Fig. 1. Snapshots represent conditions along a slice through the center of the rectangular grid, taken every 120 time steps ($\Delta t = 0.2$). For this trial and all that follow we utilize a Courant number of 0.25 and pure LFF fluxes. The initial bulb Lorentz factor γ was set to 25, and the initial full width flaring angle to 0.07 radian as measured by

$$\sqrt{v_y^2 + v_z^2}/v_x.$$

Figure 4. The spreading in ρ in the $x - z$ plane. The eight panels depict the initial state, and seven subsequent snapshots taken every 240 time steps (i.e., $\Delta t = 0.6$). The evolution represents a slice through the midplane of the grid, and the full length and width of the box are shown. Contours indicate values of 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, and 0.5 (in the same dimensionless units as shown in Fig. 3).

Figure 5. The spreading in γ in the $x - z$ plane. The conventions are the same as in the previous figure. Contours indicate values of 1.25, 2.5, 5, 10, 15, and 20. At later times the higher γ contours disappear due to deceleration. The absence of a bow shock in this depiction shows that material in front of the advancing blob is not accelerated to γ values much above unity.

Figure 6. Conservation of total rest-mass energy M and total energy E . At $t \simeq 1.6$ material starts to reach the edges of the grid and flow off, therefore one sees the start of a linear decrease in M and E . The curves which closely follow $y = 1$ show the values for M and E after correcting for material extracted from the grid. The bottom panel shows an expanded view of the region near $y = 1$ in the first panel.

Figure 7. The evolution of rest mass energy contained within various mass cuts, for the conical run (solid lines), and the evolution of the weighted x -component of the momentum $\langle \gamma v_x \rangle$, divided by 5 so as to be on a common scale with the rest mass energy curves (dashed lines). The numbers associated with the solid lines indicate the γ value used in each rest mass energy cut. We show the $\langle \gamma v_x \rangle$ evolution for the conical run (C), the spherical run (S) and the two plate runs (P1: 500×100^2 , P2: 500×50^2). For these four runs the initial spread in velocities is such that $\theta = 4^\circ$, whereas for the run labelled $v_T(0) = 0$ there is no tangential component initially to the velocities. Consequently the reduced lateral spreading rate leads to a slower $\langle \gamma v_x \rangle$ decrease. The function $f(x)$ represents a fitting

to the conical run given by $21 - 0.15(x + 0.45)^3$. Although the rest mass energy curves for $\gamma_{\text{cut}} = 1.001$ and 1.01 show a sharp increase (up until $t \sim 1.7$ when material starts to leave the edges of the grid), the near constancy of the $\gamma_{\text{cut}} = 2$ curve and the slight decline for higher γ_{cut} curves indicate that there is negligible acceleration of high- γ material. Also, the functional form of the decrease in $\langle \gamma v_x \rangle$ is similar for all runs in which $\theta = 4^\circ$ initially.

Figure 8. The location of the edge of the jet, determined by first finding the location along the direction of propagation of the maximum in either γ (*top curve*), $\rho\gamma$ (*middle curve*), or ρ (*bottom curve*), then stepping laterally to the point at which the background value has increased by 10% of its original value. (The precise value of this constant does not affect the results.) The initial maximum radius of the blob is 0.05. After $x \sim 1.8$ the two lower curves coincide.

Figure 9. The evolution of the weighted mean of the x - component of momentum and a measure of the spreading angle $\langle \theta \rangle$, taken to be the ratio of tangential to axial speeds, in the observer’s frame. Shown are (i) $\langle \gamma v_x \rangle$ (solid line) and the reciprocal of $\langle \theta \rangle$, measured in radians (dashed lines), where the lower limiting γ value used in the averaging for $\langle \theta \rangle$ is taken to be either 4, 5, or 6 (*top panel*). (ii) the $\langle \theta \rangle$ values whose reciprocal values are indicated in the first panel (*middle panel*), and (iii) the number of cells entering into the averages for the three γ_{cut} values in the first two panels (*bottom panel*). At late times the deceleration makes the $\langle \theta \rangle$ calculations problematic because the number of high γ cells drops. This progression in the loss of high γ cells can be seen at $t \gtrsim 4$ in the bottom panel.

Figure 10. Light curves constructed by summing the quantity $p_i(1 + \beta_i \cos \phi)/(1 - \beta_i \cos \phi)^2$ over the grid. We take this global sum as being a measure of the luminosity seen by an observer looking down the jet. The light curves are built up during the course of the run by summing the emission from 100 slices moving toward the observer at c that straddle

the location of the disturbance induced by the blob. Thus the light curve consists of a maximum of 100 points, where Δt is measured with respect to the arrival time of the first comoving slice. The five values of the angle ϕ between the observer and the local velocity vector of a fluid element are (going to smaller emission values) 0° , 3° , 6° , 10° , and 15° . For the “face-on” viewer (inclination = 0°), there is a mild change in the decay slope, i.e., break, between the regimes of “spherical” and “jetlike” expansion.



















